United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

-			_	
_	No. 02	2-2100	_	
Calvin C. Hollowell, Appellant, v.		_	peal from the United States strict Court for the	
Lawrence Johnson, Chief, Little Ro Police Department; Odistene Fuller	ock	* Eas * *	stern District of Arkansas. [UNPUBLISHED]	
Sgt., Little Rock Police Department James G. Johnson, Jr., Officer, Little	t; le	* *		
Rock Police Department; Domikia Barnum, Officer, Little Rock Police Department; Troy D. Ellison, Offic	e	*		
Little Rock Police Department; Robinette D. Terry, Officer, Little I Police Department; Lee A. Munson	Rock	* * *		
Little Rock Municipal Judge,		*		
Appellees. * Submitted: September 4, 2002				
Filed: September 12, 2002 Before LOKEN, BYE, and RILEY, Circuit Judges.				

PER CURIAM.

Calvin Hollowell brought this 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986 action against Little Rock, Arkansas Police Chief Lawrence Johnson, several police officers, and Municipal Judge Lee Munson. He alleged violations of the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses, and the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments, arising from his arrest and citation for patronizing a prostitute (as to which he eventually was acquitted). The district court¹ dismissed Judge Munson on the basis of judicial immunity, and granted summary judgment for the remaining defendants. The district court also denied Hollowell's motion to join two additional police officers. He appeals, and upon careful review of the record, we affirm.

Judge Munson, who presided over the municipal court trial at which Hollowell initially was found guilty, was entitled to judicial immunity, because conducting a trial is a judicial function. See Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991) (per curiam). Additionally, summary judgment was appropriate because: (1) violations of state law do not state a constitutional claim, see Marler v. Mo. State Bd. of Optometry, 102 F.3d 1453, 1457 (8th Cir. 1996); (2) the officers had probable cause to arrest Hollowell, see Smithson v. Aldrich, 235 F.3d 1058, 1062 (8th Cir. 2000); and (3) there was no constitutional violation underlying his failure-to-train and conspiracy claims, see Genosky v. Minnesota, 244 F.3d 989, 992-93 (8th Cir. 2001); Brandon v. Lotter, 157 F.3d 537, 539 (8th Cir. 1998); Schulz v. Long, 44 F.3d 643, 650 (8th Cir. 1995). Finally, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Hollowell's motion to join parties.

Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹The HONORABLE G. THOMAS EISELE, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

A	true	copy.
---	------	-------

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.